

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 – 7, 10 – 12, and 18 – 21 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

#### Response to Amendment

Applicants previously objected to the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice. The Office Action stated that "Applicant(s) must state their traversal on the record", which was done. "Second, and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.111(b) which requires Applicant(s) to specifically point out the supposed errors in the Office Action, Applicant(s) must state why the Official Notice Statement(s) are not to be considered common knowledge or well known in the art.

Applicants objected to the following statement by the Examiner, which has been re-asserted in this Office Action: "Official Notice is taken that it is old and very well known to enable varying levels of permissions, privileges, authorizations and/or access to various groups (roles) of weblog members (e.g. readers vs. authors, blog members vs. owners, etc.). Official Notice was traversed previously by Applicants based on the assertion that the statement was overbroad. References were subsequently cited by the Examiner in support of the Official Notice statement. The Applicants asserted that the cited references state what the references state and that is all. The Applicants did not, and do not, concede that any of the recited references teach what the Office Actions states which is, that it is old and very well known to "enable varying levels of permissions, privileges, authorizations and/or access to various groups

(roles) of weblog members (e.g. readers vs. authors, blog members vs. owners, etc.).” The Applicants maintain the assertion that this statement is overly broad and the Applicants cannot concede that the cited references support it. The Applicants repeat, the cited references teach what the cited references state – not what the Examiner says that they state.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1 – 7, which are method claims, were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is argued in pages 11 – 13 of the Office Action that Claims 1 – 7 are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus. Claim 1 has been amended such that the steps are performed “on a computing device” or displayed “on a display device”. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1 – 7, 10 - 12, and 13 – 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Project 2000 as evidenced by Pyron et al., Using Microsoft Project 2000 (2000; MS Project) in view of Clark, U.S. Patent No. 7,062, 449. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as MS Project and Clark, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants’ invention as now claimed.

The Applicants’ invention as now set forth in exemplary claim 1 includes a method for tracking the status of a workflow. The method includes the steps of:

“instantiating an instance of a workflow on a computing device by a workflow user, the workflow user being assigned to a role in the workflow, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps;

generating a weblog on a computing device to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog accessible to weblog members, wherein the weblog members include members who are and members who are not workflow users, first weblog members with permission to view workflow status and weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status and view and post weblog comments;

causing communication between the workflow and the weblog to automatically post an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred, the entry being physically viewable on a display device by weblog members.”

Thus, in accordance with the invention as now claimed, the weblog is accessible to weblog members who are interested in the status of the workflow but are not necessarily workflow users. (Specification [00024] “Individuals outside the scope of the workflow instance 50 may be able to manually post entries in the workflow weblog 54 if they have access rights. For example, a director or manager may not fulfill a role in the workflow instance 50 but may still be able to post if the director or manager supervises any of the members in the workflow instance 50. In addition, anyone aggregating the workflow weblog 54 has rights and, therefore, can manually post a comment.”, [00034] “The general manager may not be a direct member of many, or perhaps even all, of the workflows identified in the aggregator view 106, however, the general manager still has access based on assigned privileges”, “The view 118 below lists other channel groups (i.e., groupings of feeds) of interest to the general manager, including dealership feeds, personal (office) weblog feeds, and personal interest feeds derived from sources unrelated to the dealership.”)

The Applicants thereby have provided a way to link actions occurring in a workflow application to a physically viewable weblog application, viewable by the users of the workflow and/or the members of the weblog, wherein the members of the weblog may or may not be workflow users.

The Applicants respectfully submit that MS Project and Clark, taken in any combination or part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as now claimed. The invention as now claimed requires that a workflow be instantiated by a user, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps. In addition, the weblog is accessible by weblog members, wherein the weblog members include members who are and members who are not workflow users. This weblog can be viewed by some ("first weblog members") and posted to by others ("second weblog members"). Weblog members may be first and/or second weblog members. Note that a user of the workflow need not have the capability to post to the weblog, it will be automatically updated when his/her actions on a workflow step occur. Likewise, the user of the weblog need not have the capability to update the workflow, nor need he be a workflow user.

The updates referred to in MS Project are updates made manually by workflow users themselves. MS Project does not contemplate a weblog for weblog members and non-project members. To use the features of MS Project, you must be executing MS Project and be a workflow user. Clark only tracks its own internal workflow and does not indicate that non-workflow users can access a weblog. In Clark, everything described is relative to the "user" of the "project data" or the managers involved in the project, so no non-workflow users would be involved. Thus, no combination of these references can teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as now claimed including the step of "generating a weblog on a computing device to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog accessible to weblog members, wherein the weblog members include members who are and members who are not workflow users, first

weblog members with permission to view workflow status and weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status and view and post weblog comments.

For all the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2 – 7 are in condition for allowance. Independent Claims 10 and 18 contain limitations similar to that of Claim 1; therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 10 – 12, and 18 – 21 are also in condition for allowance.

2. Claims 1, 10, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwanke, U.S. patent Publication No. 2003/008508 (sic) in view of Udell, Telling a Story (2001) and further in view of Doctorow et al., Essential Blogging (2002). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Schwanke teaches a data-triggered workflow engine (Schwanke, Abstract). Nowhere in Schwanke is the use of weblogs suggested. Therefore, Schwanke cannot teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed step of "generating a weblog on a computing device to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog accessible to weblog members, wherein the weblog members include members who are and members who are not workflow users, first weblog members with permission to view workflow status and weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status and view and post weblog comments.

Udell vaguely suggests using a weblog in a work environment. Udell generally references the possibility using a weblog as part of project management, and does not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed step of "generating a weblog on a computing device to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog accessible to weblog members, wherein the weblog members include members who are and members who are not workflow users, first weblog

members with permission to view workflow status and weblog comments, and second weblog members with permission to view workflow status and view and post weblog comments.

Since neither Schwanke or Udell teach or suggest this claimed step, there is no way to combine them to arrive at the Applicants' claimed invention.

Finally, the Office Action points out that neither Schwanke nor Udell expressly teach managing weblog permissions as claimed. The Office Action states that Doctorow teaches weblog accessibility. But Doctorow adds nothing further to Schwanke or Udell to solve their deficiencies. Schwanke, Udell, and Doctorow, taken apart or in any combination, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention including the step of generating a weblog a computing device to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog accessible to weblog members, wherein the weblog members include members who are and members who are not workflow users". For all the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2 – 7 are in condition for allowance. Independent Claims 10 and 18 contain limitations similar to that of Claim 1; therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 10 – 12, and 18 - 21 are also in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant(s) submit(s) that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003, or preferably, at mobile number (617)-901-6786.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to  
Deposit Account No. 12-2158.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 24, 2011  
Reg. No. 37,946

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003  
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Mary Steubing/  
Mary Steubing  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP  
5 Mount Royal Avenue  
Mount Royal Office Park  
Marlborough, MA 01752